

**REMARKS**

The Examiner's action of March 11, 2005 has been received and reviewed by counsel for Assignee. In that action the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by *Lowery, et al.*, U.S 5, 894, 554.

By this response, counsel has canceled all of the claims and submits herewith new claims 12-22. These claims correspond generally with the previously submitted claims, but have been rewritten to place them in better grammatical English and highlight the patentable distinctions between Applicants' claimed invention and the prior art relied upon by the Examiner.

Next, the Applicants' invention is discussed, followed by discussion of the prior art. Finally, an explanation is made of the distinctions between the claimed invention and the cited references.

An important aspect of Applicants' invention is the ability to provide an integrated page for display on a client which integrates into a single window information from various pages on various servers, for example over the world wide web. In addition, Applicants' system as described in the application provides a further feature of automatically copying data items which are shared among the various pages into the page before it is displayed on the client system. In a typical performed embodiment of Applicants' invention, the method includes accessing web servers which provide objects on pages. Applicants' system fetches these pages and creates an integrated page based on the fetched pages. When a definition of the integrated page contains a data object, Applicants' apparatus creates an integrated page by inserting a script to automatically copy common data items on the browser into the fetched pages.

In contrast, the Lowery reference, as well as all the other references cited by the Examiner, appear to teach only display of integrated web pages. None of the references that teaches the aspect of Applicants' invention of copying common data among the various pages retrieved to display them on the client. The Examiner's discussion of Lowery does describe that Lowery provides HTML extension tags specifying a data source from which to retrieve data. Counsel believes, however, this is a different approach than that claimed in Applicants' claims herein. As described by Lowery at column 2 line 15-34, column 5 lines 39-47, and column 6,

lines 32-48, each instance of data retrieval appears to be limited to retrieving data for that particular page. None of these sections of Lowery appear to teach the idea as claimed by Applicants in all independent claims, of copying common data to the user interface from the plurality of servers to each other, thereby integrating the common data over all pages shown on the user interface.

By this response counsel has attempted to clarify each of the independent claims to more clearly specify this unique feature of Applicants' invention. On this basis, all claims are believed to patentability distinguish the cited references.

To perfect the priority claim for this application, counsel encloses a certified copy of the Japanese priority document for filing herein.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-324-6303 (direct).

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Colwell  
Reg. No. 27,431

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
RCC:c3a  
60594016 v1